

Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000500340084-1

Does the CIA Dominate U.S. Foreign Policy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, April 25, 1959

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "Does the CIA Dominate U.S. Foreign Policy" written by Frank Bellamy and published in the National Guardian of April 20, 1959.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DOES THE CIA DOMINATE U.S. FOREIGN POLICY?

(By Frank Bellamy)

"If war is too important to be left to the generals, it should be clear that intelligence is too important to be left unsupervised." (Hanson Baldwin, N.Y. Times, Jan. 15, 1958.)

Spying has become a major industry of American Government. According to Harper's magazine (April 1958) no fewer than nine separate, cloak-and-dagger outfits are at work, carrying out clandestine intrigue on a worldwide basis and expending each year in the neighborhood of \$750 million of the taxpayers' money.

"Though exact figures are secret, estimates suggest that between 20,000 to 30,000 fulltime intelligence specialists currently are on Government payrolls," said Harry Howe Hanson, author of Central Intelligence and National Security, in the Christian Science Monitor (Dec. 1, 1958). "The cost probably approaches \$750 million annually."

The most lushly financed, of course, is the Central Intelligence Agency. The other eight, which have to get along on lesser amounts, are the intelligence branches of the National Security Agency, State Department, Atomic Energy Commission, U.S. Information Agency, FBI, Army, Navy, and Air Force.

NO CONTROLS

The CIA, now housed in 50 or more scattered buildings in Washington, is erecting an enormous \$55 million edifice for itself across the river in Virginia. When completed it will be the world's biggest spy center, accommodating more than 10,000 CIA employees. Best estimates place CIA's total domestic payroll at 14,000 and its budget near \$600 million a year.

After it was established in 1947 under President Truman's administration, this professional undercover army was granted by law a degree of immunity from accountability for funds, personnel, and activities probably never exceeded by any other Federal agency in American history.

It is the only major agency not subject to congressional committee control.

Nobody except the President and a few other persons, including 10 or 12 select Congressmen who are briefed once a year at budget time, know how much the secret legion spends. All funds for CIA are disguised and concealed in appropriations for other agencies.

The funds that the CIA is not subject to audit. Top generals and even Welsh Dukes can write a \$1 million check without explaining the CIA's role in it. It is the only major Federal agency, under the President,

The CIA is exempted by law from the Civil Service requirements imposed on most Government agencies; it can hire and fire at will.

SACRED COW

This is too much power and supersecrecy for Senator Mike Mansfield, Democrat, Montana. Four times he has sponsored bills to create a joint Senate-House watchdog committee to scrutinize CIA. Despite editorial backing from such influential papers as the New York Times and Wall Street Journal, Mansfield lost each time. Most of his colleagues in Congress still look on CIA as a sacred cow.

Why is the CIA so inordinately jealous of its power and prerogatives, so anxious to maintain itself beyond the reach of the law-makers? One reason, the record seems to indicate, is to cover up bungles—some ludicrous, most of them expensive—which would open it to ridicule.

On the ludicrous side, "there are such stories as the news account in a Washington paper some months back of a free-for-all in a downtown restaurant between CIA and FBI men. Each group, the paper reported, had mistaken the other for Communist agents." (New York Times, Mar. 15, 1958.)

On the expensive side, there was the time—as reported by columnist Westbrook Pegler—that "agents of the CIA handed over \$10 million in unmarked \$10 bills to the secret service of the Communist Government of Poland in the belief that they were dealing with some underground organization which was opposing that government."

Pegler, by the way, thinks the CIA is "no good and ought to be wiped out."

PLAIN LOUSY

Then there are intelligence failures for which CIA would rather not be held accountable. The most publicized fumble was its floundering on the eruption of revolutions in Lebanon and Iraq. Both took place without advance forecasts from our vast espionage network. "They didn't know what was going on," Senator Wayne Morse, Democrat, of Oregon, angrily charged. "Our intelligence is just plain lousy."

The New York Times' military expert Hanson Baldwin said (Jan. 15, 1958): "The intelligence record of the Nation and the CIA in particular is spotty. There have been notable successes but also notable failures. . . . A great many other incidents also suggest that all is not well with our intelligence establishments."

A more significant motive for secrecy than concealing bungles and fumbles is CIA's desire to keep its bag of "dirty tricks" from the eyes of the public. It realizes that millions would disapprove if many of its devious dealings came to light. Protests would surely follow exposure of the extent to which CIA adventurism has shaped U.S. diplomacy and, in policy toward some nations, replaced it altogether.

POLICYMAKER

Charles Edmundson, who spent 8 years in the U.S. Foreign Service before resigning 2 years ago over Secretary Dulles' policies, accused the CIA in February's Progressive magazine of being "an activist group which steps in boldly to dictate foreign policy in areas not covered by decisions of Congress, the State Department, or the White House."

Edmundson went on: "It executes its projects without concern over the reaction of the public. The incidents it provokes are never acknowledged, yet can be decisive in shaping—or misshaping—public opinion and foreign policy. . . ."

"The most fundamental of all civil liberties is the right of the citizen to make up his mind on public issues without having the facts concealed or distorted by his Government. The record shows that the CIA, in cooperation with the State Department, systematically contravenes this principle. A

few examples of what is happening creep obscurely into some of the better newspapers, but nowhere, save in a few liberal publications, are Americans warned of the potential consequences of the farflung operations of the secrecy-ridden CIA.

Liaison between the State Department and CIA is close. Both are headed by a Dulles. Both employ about the same number of people (16,000 for the State Department versus an estimated 14,000 for the CIA). If the CIA's \$600 million budget is correct, it is more than twice as much as the State Department spends on its 282 diplomatic outposts around the world.

In any case, the secret decisions of the Brothers Dulles affect the fate of the world. When ill-directed, they make enemies abroad and cause great damage at home.

Hanson Baldwin summed it up well (New York Times, Jan. 15, 1958):

"Uncontrolled secret intelligence agencies are in a position to dominate policymaking, and hence government. Their very secrecy gives them power; there are few to accept or reject their findings. . . . Any overpowered secret intelligence agency is dangerous, not alone to the formulation of sound policy, but to the viability of democratic institutions."

Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000500340084-1